	1
;•	3
BEFORE THE P	UBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF THE
	AUG 1 1 1999
Deitra Brouk	) Missouri Public Service Commissi
(your name) Complainant	
	)
VS.	) Case No. <u>EC - 2000 - 132</u> )
	) )
AMEREN UE (company name)	)
Responde	nt. )
	COMPLAINT
Complainant resides at 1	+7 m m nork. when the
Ulman, Mo 6508	
Ulman, Mo 6509	<u>3</u> .
1. Respondent,	AMEREN UE (company name)
Ulman, Mo 6509	AMEREN UE
1. Respondent,	AMEREN UE
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis</u> , <u>Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri.
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis</u> , <u>Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th	AMEREN UE
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis, Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th 2. As the basis of this complain	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri. ht, complainant states the following facts:
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis, Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th 2. As the basis of this complain <u>Irregular Service: Powe</u>	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri. Int, complainant states the following facts: er outages for periods in excess of two h
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis, Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th 2. As the basis of this complain	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri. Int, complainant states the following facts: er outages for periods in excess of two h
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis, Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th 2. As the basis of this complain <u>Irregular Service: Powe</u>	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri. Int, complainant states the following facts: er outages for periods in excess of two h
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis, Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th 2. As the basis of this complain <u>Irregular Service: Powe</u>	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri. Int, complainant states the following facts: er outages for periods in excess of two h
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis, Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th 2. As the basis of this complain <u>Irregular Service: Powe</u>	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri. Int, complainant states the following facts: er outages for periods in excess of two h
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis, Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th 2. As the basis of this complain <u>Irregular Service: Powe</u>	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri. Int, complainant states the following facts: er outages for periods in excess of two h
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis, Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th 2. As the basis of this complain <u>Irregular Service: Powe</u>	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri. Int, complainant states the following facts: er outages for periods in excess of two h
1. Respondent, of <u>St. Louis, Missouri</u> the Public Service Commission of th 2. As the basis of this complain <u>Irregular Service: Powe</u>	AMEREN UE (company name) , is a public utility under the jurisdiction of the State of Missouri. ht, complainant states the following facts: er outages for periods in excess of two h

-

(

ĺ

ĺ

١

3. The complainant has taken the following steps to present this complaint to the respondent:

Contacted Ameren UE and reported power outages.

• ••

WHEREFORE, Complainant now requests the following relief:

..

Powerline to be upgraded to efficiently handle customer load and

eliminate power outages.

Date

Signature of Complainant



GORDON L. PERSINGER Acting Executive Director Director, Research and Public Affairs WESS A. HENDERSON Director, Utility Operations ROBERT SCHALLENBERG Director, Utility Services DONNA M. KOLILIS Director, Administration DALE HARDY ROBERTS

Secretary/Chief Regulatory Law Judge DANA K. JOYCE General Counsel

## Missouri Public Service Commission

Commissioners SHEILA LUMPE

Chair HAROLD CRUMPTON

CONNIE MURRAY

ROBERT G. SCHEMENAUER

M. DIANNE DRAINER Vice Chair POST OFFICE BOX 360 JEFFERSON CITY, MISSOURI 65102 573-751-3234 573-751-1847 (Fax Number) http://www.ecodev.state.mo.us/psc/

## Information Sheet Regarding Mediation of Commission Formal Complaint Cases

Mediation is a process whereby the parties themselves work to resolve their dispute with the aid of a neutral third-party mediator. This process is sometimes referred to as "facilitated negotiation." The mediator's role is advisory and although the mediator may offer suggestions, the mediator has no authority to impose a solution nor will the mediator determine who "wins." Instead, the mediator simply works with both parties to facilitate communications and to attempt to enable the parties to reach an agreement which is mutually agreeable to both the complainant and the respondent.

The mediation process is explicitly a problem-solving one in which neither the parties nor the mediator are bound by the usual constraints such as the rules of evidence or the other formal procedures required in hearings before the Missouri Public Service Commission. Although many private mediators charge as much as \$250 per hour, the University of Missouri-Columbia School of Law has agreed to provide this service to parties who have formal complaints pending before the Public Service Commission at no charge. Not only is the service provided free of charge, but mediation is also less expensive than the formal complaint process because the assistance of an attorney is not necessary for mediation. In fact, the parties are encouraged not to bring an attorney to the mediation meeting.

The formal complaint process before the Commission invariably results in a determination by which there is a "winner" and a "loser" although the value of winning may well be offset by the cost of attorneys fees and the delays of protracted litigation. Mediation is not only a much quicker process but it also offers the unique opportunity for informal, direct communication between the two parties to the complaint and mediation is far more likely to result in a settlement which, because it was mutually agreed to, pleases both parties. This is traditionally referred to as "win-win" agreement.

i s 1

The traditional mediator's role is to (1) help the participants understand the mediation process, (2) facilitate their ability to speak directly to each other, (3) maintain order, (4) clarify misunderstandings, (5) assist in identifying issues, (6) diffuse unrealistic expectations, (7) assist in translating one participant's perspective or proposal into a form that is more understandable and acceptable to the other participant, (8) assist the participants with the actual negotiation process, (9) occasionally a mediator may propose a possible solution, and (10) on rare occasions a mediator may encourage a participant to accept a particular solution. The mediator will not possess any specialized knowledge of the utility industry or of utility law.

In order for the Commission to refer a complaint case to mediation, the parties must both agree to mediate their conflict in good faith. The party filing the complaint must agree to appear and to make a good faith effort to mediate and the utility company against which the complaint has been filed must send a representative who has full authority to settle the complaint case. The essence of mediation stems from the fact that the participants are both genuinely interested in resolving the complaint.

Because mediation thrives in an atmosphere of free and open discussion, all settlement offers and other information which is revealed during mediation is shielded against subsequent disclosure in front of the Missouri Public Service Commission and is considered to be privileged information. The only information which must be disclosed to the Public Service Commission is (a) whether the case has been settled and (b) whether, irrespective of the outcome, the mediation effort was considered to be a worthwhile endeavor. The Commission will not ask what took place during the mediation.

If the dispute is settled at the mediation, the Commission will require a signed release from the complainant in order for the Commission to dismiss the formal complaint case.

If the dispute is not resolved through the mediation process, neither party will be prejudiced for having taken part in the mediation and, at that point, the formal complaint case will simply resume its normal course.

Date: January 25, 1999

Hole Hred, Roberts

Dale Hardy Roberts Secretary of the Commission

ECEIV AUG 2 6 1999

AUG 2 0 1000

COMMISSION COUNTER